



JEFFERSON PARK EXPANSION
PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING #2
Thursday, October 20, 2005
Jefferson Lawn Bowling Clubhouse

MEETING SUMMARY

PAT Members Present: Shellwyn Badger Mike Carney
Mira Latoszek Steve Galey
Nancy Spurgeon Stuart McFeely

PAT Members Absent: Monique Cherrier Cheryl Fraser (Facilitator)
Bruce Bentley
Bert Caoili

Other attendees: Randy Smith, Jefferson Community Center Coordinator
Richard Wilson (attending for Monique Cherrier)
JB Dennison, Washington DOE
Greg Brower, The Berger Partnership
Andy Mitton, The Berger Partnership
Pat Barlow, PACE Engineering
Elizabeth Conner, Artist

Meeting Facilitator: Randy Robinson, Project Manager

Welcome: The PAT sign-in sheet was circulated and signed.

Role of PAT: The overall role of the PAT, as directed by Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds, is to discuss the new park development plans and prioritize the elements. The goal of tonight's meeting is to get a broad visionary view of Jefferson Park and what makes the park unique.

Previous Meeting Notes: Meeting summary from 9/15/05 was approved with no corrections by PAT members.

Project Progress Report: Randy R. gave an update on the Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) reservoir project and their schedule.
The Jefferson Park Expansion project schedule was quickly reviewed with the following key dates mentioned: next PAT meeting – 11/17/05, Parks Preview – late November, the Seattle Design Commission – early December, the next public meeting – mid December. Schematic Design should be largely complete by the end of December, then we will move on to Design Development.
Randy summarized the 1st public meeting on Sept. 29, 2005 and then introduced the design tool (Velcro boards) that The Berger Partnership had developed to help the citizens visualize the need to prioritize which park elements are included in this current project and which project elements would be left to future phases. Speaking of prioritization:

Project Element Prioritization: Randy asked if the prioritization/cost sheets were received and filled out? A few PAT members had done this but wanted some extra time, so it was

agreed that forms should be turned in at the end of the meeting or e-mailed to Randy. The mention of costs launched a series of questions and discussion about how the PAT should be exploring the costs of project elements at this stage of the project (Stuart, Steve and Myra). It was suggested that for this early stage of design that we could just think in terms of percentages of the total project budget.

Andy Mitton mentioned that more detailed cost estimates would be done at each subsequent level of design (final schematic design, design development, contract documents) with increasing accuracy at each level.

Myra suggested that all of the project elements that were in the project “for sure” or funded separately be set aside and then deal with how much money is left for everything else.

Randy R. mentioned that Myra’s suggestion is best addressed by the explanation of the “Velcro boards” from the public meeting.

Greg Brower explained the red squares on the Velcro board are the “for sure” elements that Myra mentioned (park infrastructure or separate funding). These elements such as: electrical, water supply, storm drainage, grading, lawn planting, some trees, etc. would require about 40% of the budget. That leaves about 60% of the budget to be discussed and agreed upon by the PAT. There was consensus in the group that we really needed to focus on those elements that comprise the 60%.

The discussion then shifted to the larger vision in the park with a promise that we would come back to the project elements.

Overall Park Vision:

Nancy asked if the water feature was desired by the citizens at the public meeting? Shellwyn, who was at the public meeting, said yes.

Greg mentioned that the water feature at Cal Anderson defines that park. What defines Jefferson, what makes it special? (Greg).

Is it an open space, an Olmsted park, is it a ballfield park? (Steve).

Having a **park** here is special (Myra).

Views make it special (Stuart).

Nancy mentioned that **diversity** is what the neighborhood is about, but asked what we can do to draw people into the park. Currently, it seems like the park is just for golfers and tennis players when viewed from Beacon Avenue. The fences, etc. are not welcoming.

Steve said that Jefferson could be a place with one **major sport event** and then other things going on around the central area.

Greg responded that the park has “**terraces**” or “planes” of activity or functional use “rooms”.

Mike has three legs of his vision for the park: 1) **Soccer** gives the park an international, diverse flavor and should be central, 2) the plaza pavers could reflect diverse neighborhood groups with tiles set in paving as part of future neighborhood projects, 3) plants could be planted by neighborhood groups that reflect different ethnic groups cultural interests (Bonsai, etc.). Mike stressed that the “**patchwork**” nature of the park is good. Mike Carney left the meeting at 7:30 after relaying his vision ideas.

Greg responded that the patchwork quality reflects the way the park has evolved over time.

Steve asked: what is the BIG idea? **Diversity** is one idea that can be reflected in many ways such as the actual facility, programmed activities, plants, etc.

Randy asked that each PAT member give their vision of the park in one

minute or less in a go-around the table.

Myra mentioned that the idea of **invitation** was important. How can we invite the public into the park from the street entrances and allow the **flow** of people through the park “**rooms**” in a way that makes sense.

Stuart stressed that the 2002 Site Plan had already set up the framework for organization of the park: the facilities (community center, tennis, golf, etc.) were grouped on the east and south of the park thereby opening up the north and west to the great **view** of the city and Puget Sound. The park is not about diversity, it is about open space and people. Open space on Beacon Hill is on 17% of the area (lowest in the city except for maybe South Park). Open space is the key.

Shellwyn commented that **beauty** is what draws people to the park. She also believes that we need to meet the needs of the people who are already using the park (Samoan Cricket, etc.). She thinks Jefferson PF should be looked at again.

Nancy felt that **families** are important – they are what Beacon Hill is all about – generations of people. Also, the current location of the play area is not good.

Richard Wilson (sitting in for Monique) mentioned that athletic fields could be based at the existing Jefferson PF and more of the central park could be just open space.

DB Dennison (Washington DOE) commented that a guy he just talked to in the park said: “just give us **space**, don’t clutter it up”.

Randy R. thanked everyone for the visionary ideas – that is what the design team really needs at this point.

Project Element Prioritization:

Randy R. asked Greg to review each project element on the Velcro board that was not a red square (infrastructure or funded separately), take it off the board and get buyoff from the PAT before putting it back on the board. The elements that are considered part of the infrastructure are as follows: **demolition, drainage, electrical upgrade, basic electrical and lighting, irrigation infrastructure, basic lawn, basic grading, play area, tennis courts.**

The elements that are not part of the “infrastructure” that are currently proposed as being part of this project are as follows: **north meadow irrigation, picnic table pads, trees and shrubs, expanded parking at the CC, irrigation around the CC, plaza and pavers, promenade walkway, other paths, storm water feature, water geyser, synthetic soccer field, restrooms.** (These are shown on the Project Velcro Board).

There was some discussion pertaining to each element reviewed.

Sustainable systems (water use, plants, storm water) were stressed by Steve and others as being important overall.

The skateboard park was mentioned and then questioned. Randy responded that the City of Seattle is looking for a skate group in southeast Seattle to work with in planning/site selection of a skate facility. Beacon Hill may be a good place, but then again maybe it should be in the Rainier Valley or elsewhere. Myra mentioned that in 2001-2002 there were skateboard interests represented but did not know their background.

Randy Smith mentioned that the entry from Beacon through a covered space between the old CC and the proposed “new” CC would really draw people through the CC into the park.

Native plants at the CC are OK but lets not “undersize” the system

(irrigation) at the CC because the CC is also a focal point of the park. How do the paths relate to the streetscape? Can the entries and paths attract people and guide them into the park? Current entries are not good. Storm water re-use is a sustainable practice (Greg). Myra mentioned keeping the SPU reservoir water “spout”. There was some discussion by PAT members, consultants and staff about expanded use of Jefferson Playfield (cricket field) and ball field lighting. Randy responded that the 2002 Site Plan shows extensive renovation of Jefferson PF and lighting of that field and only moderate use of the Jefferson Park fields (over the reservoir). Jefferson PF is not on the proposed work for this current project because of the importance of creating the new park land in the former reservoir area of Jefferson Park. Should we reconsider that assumption? (Greg). There was no support among PAT members for shifting funds from the north and central part of Jefferson Park down to Jefferson PF. Randy pointed out that no lighting has been recommended for the center of Jefferson Park (over the reservoir) in the 2002 Plan. Lighting of athletic fields is a very contentious issue and would add years to our project schedule. Different methods of irrigation and equipment were discussed by several team members. In the end of the discussion most of the items previously selected to part of this project were returned to the Velcro “project budget” board. One item (**irrigation of the north meadow**) were shifted down from the Project Velcro Board to the top of the “waiting list”. One element from the list of alternate elements (**perimeter streetscape**) was shifted up to the top of the “waiting list”. Randy suggested that one cost effective way to look at streetscape is to focus on the entry points. Stuart asked that project elements be identified that can be constructed later. Greg said: yes. It was suggested (Steve) that the Berger Partnership bring a plan showing these elements as a proposal next meeting. Or alternative plans (Shellwyn).

Conclusion:

Randy concluded the meeting by committing the PAT to the following actions:

1. Randy will rework the Prioritization/Cost form showing the relationships to the overall budget in percentages and e-mail to PAT.
2. PAT members will submit the Prioritization/Cost forms to Randy when complete.
3. Randy will make a copy of the program priority ranking system of High, Medium and Low Priority and send e-mail to PAT.
4. The Berger Partnership will work on the Schematic Design Plan that integrates the overall visions of tonight’s meeting as well as the prioritization from tonight and the prioritization/cost forms.

Next meeting:

Next PAT meeting is November 17, 2005 at 6:30 PM at the Jefferson Lawn Bowling Clubhouse.

Summary By:

rfr

Additional Information is Available:

- Park web site: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/jeffersonparkexpansion.htm>
- Randy Robinson, Seattle Parks Project Manager, (206) 684-7035; randy.robinson@seattle.gov
- Cheryl Fraser, Parks Resources Manager, (206) 684-8016; cheryl.fraser@seattle.gov